

Georgeist reform is not going to come down out of Heaven full grown and settle over the entire earth. Free Trade can only grow gradually. It can only grow as men begin to trust one another and to adopt the same moral and political code.

In a union with England there is the obvious danger of "Anglo-American imperialism," so called. But as long as this imperialism professes our moral and political code, we will be limited only by our own blundering efforts to master and use these democratic tools.

The November, 1941, issue of *Modern Industry* contained a debate, "Would a Federal Union of Democracies Benefit Free Enterprise?" This magazine is circulated among managers and foremen in industry. The result of a postcard poll of these people on the question was 60 per cent Yes and 40 per cent No. As far as understanding the significance of and approving a Federal Union of the democracies, these non-Georgeists are far ahead of our "fundamental Georgeists," many of whom are anglophobes.

A union between the United States and the British Commonwealth is the one actual step forward that can come of this war. This is the one reform that can rouse any considerable majority support and enthusiasm. These are the only tariff walls which can be broken down without blind and strong opposition. It is a tendency towards Free Trade which can only take place between peoples governed by the same moral and political code. Such a union would be powerful enough to eliminate any further possibility of nationalistic wars which have confused our social thinking. If we do not secure for ourselves a fairly high degree of safety from foreign attack, we must remain that much longer in a protection economy. The only road to a Free Society is under our form of government, and the greater the extension of our common laws throughout the world, the better are our chances to bring about our reform. A union with the British Commonwealth is a start in this direction.

To our "fundamental" Georgeists all this may be "politics." To me it is the practice of a faith. Politics is no more than the application of our beliefs to our common affairs. It is the example which George himself set for us. And it is a belief consistent with, and part of, our long liberal struggle for justice. It is a militant belief which uses all the tools available.

Since Pearl Harbor, it may well be that we are at the beginning of the end—that we are living at the climax of our materialistic Georgeism, its interpretations already dust and ashes in men's mouths, and its appalling consequences no longer matters of academic debate but of bitter and shocking experience.

Our schools, of course, must stick to education. But they must turn out graduates who will be ready to attach themselves to liberal movements, and be a leaven among them. For education doesn't merely present information. Its object is to free the human mind of past ignorance. It directs and persuades. It arouses hopes and emotions.

Only educators who have retreated to an ivory tower can be indifferent to the oppression around us. They may in their "wisdom" bargain with it, but we who are the followers and teachers of the liberal Henry George will find ourselves fighting against the landlords and monopolists whenever and wherever we can.

Education which is opposed to the landlords and the monopolists must rouse the determination to resist this oppression, to check it, to cut it down, and to crush it. Education upset feudalism. It will bring us Freedom.

An age of catastrophe can be used as the beginning of a better order. Never in the history of our Western civilization have we had such an opportunity to finally consolidate all our past gains and set forth to gain the greatest Freedom. To achieve this desirable end, we must reorient our movement and place it at the leadership of the world liberal movement.

This means, as I have been saying, that we must first place most of our emphasis on George's moral reform, not the fiscal or material. Second, we must evaluate events around us with this moral criterion and not the materialism of our fiscal reform. Third, we must, with more charity and sympathy, work closer to other people and groups of goodwill. The responsibility for taking these steps rests upon us.

[Mr. Bashian is a trustee of the Henry George Institute of New England, with headquarters in Boston, operating under charter from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We believe that the Boston school might well be taken as a model of good sense and tolerance in disseminating the principles of Henry George.—Ed.]

## It Happened in Alabama

THE following news item appeared in *The Fairhope Courier*: "MOBILE, ALA.—Flabbergasted was the word for the county board of roads and revenues when it received this letter from Joseph J. Jives: 'My land was so poor it wouldn't even grow cactus, but when you put a road through it, those 10 acres became the richest plot in the whole county, thanks to a combination grocery store and jook joint I have erected. . . . Enclosed you will find a check for \$142.22, which you will please have credited to the county's road and bridge fund. This sum represents one per cent. of the unearned increment and my appreciation for the service the county has done me.'"

Well might the county board be flabbergasted at the concrete acknowledgment of this unusual landowner. But they might do better to be impressed by their own lack of discernment. "If it were a dog it would bite them." No doubt many other landowners are less ostensibly and more inwardly blessing the government for making their land valuable through public services, with nary a thought of laying claim to any of the increased value so created. Not-so-discerning county boards should ponder the lesson this isolated case of gratitude offers: Why not charge for public services out of the unearned land-value increment the public services create?